

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136p), the Administrator may, at her discretion, exempt a state agency from any registration provision of FIFRA if she determines that emergency conditions exist which require such exemption. The Applicants have requested the Administrator to issue specific exemptions for the use of propazine on sorghum to control pigweed. Information in accordance with 40 CFR part 166 was submitted as part of this request.

Sorghum is grown as a rotational crop with cotton and wheat, in order to comply with the soil conservation requirements. Propazine, which was formerly registered for use on sorghum, was voluntarily canceled by the former Registrant, who did not wish to support its re-registration. The Applicants claim that this has left sorghum growers in Oklahoma and New Mexico with no preemergent herbicides that will adequately control certain broadleaf weeds, especially pigweed. Until 1993-4, the first season an exemption was requested, growers were using existing stocks of propazine. The Applicants state that other available herbicides have serious limitations on their use, making them unsuitable for control of pigweed in sorghum. Although the original Registrant of propazine has decided not to support this chemical through reregistration, another company has committed to support the data requirements for this use. Propazine was once registered for this use, but has now been voluntarily canceled and is therefore considered to be a new chemical.

The Applicants state that, since growers used existing stocks of propazine between the time of its voluntary cancellation and the availability of propazine under an emergency exemption, yields have not shown a decrease. However, the Applicants claim that significant economic losses will occur without the availability of propazine.

The Applicants propose to apply propazine at a maximum rate of 1.2 lbs. active ingredient (a.i.), (2.4 pts. of product) per acre, by ground or air, with a maximum of one application per crop growing season. Therefore, use under this exemption could potentially amount to a maximum total of 336,000 lbs. of active ingredient (84,000 gal. of product) in Oklahoma, and 60,000 lbs. of active ingredient (15,000 gal. of product) in New Mexico. This is the second time that Oklahoma and New Mexico have applied for this use of propazine on sorghum under section 18

of FIFRA. Oklahoma and New Mexico were issued exemptions for this use for last growing season.

This notice does not constitute a decision by EPA on the applications themselves. The regulations governing section 18 require publication of a notice of receipt of an application for a specific exemption proposing use of a new chemical (i.e., an active ingredient not contained in any currently registered pesticide). Such notice provides for opportunity for public comment on the application.

Accordingly, interested persons may submit written views on this subject to the Field Operations Division at the address above.

The Agency, accordingly, will review and consider all comments received during the comment period in determining whether to issue the emergency exemptions requested by the Oklahoma and New Mexico Departments of Agriculture.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Crisis exemptions.

Dated: January 6, 1995.

Lois Rossi,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95-1190 Filed 1-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collection Requirement Submitted to Office of Management and Budget for Review

January 6, 1995.

The Federal Communications Commission has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3507).

Copies of this submission may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., 2100 M Street, NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037, (202) 857-3800. For further information on this submission contact Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418-0214. Persons wishing to comment on this information collection should contact Timothy Fain, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10214 NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395-3561.

OMB Number: 3060-0149.

Title: Part 63—§ 214 Application and Supplemental Information Requirements (§ 63.01 - 63.601).

Action: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit.

Frequency of Response: Quarterly, and on occasion reporting requirements.

Estimated Annual Burden: 510 responses, 13.3 hours average burden per response, 6,820 hours total annual burden.

Needs and Uses: The Commission modified its rules to enable local telephone companies (LECs) to participate in the video marketplace through video dialtone. The Commission concluded that allowing telephone company involvement in the video marketplace, consistent with statutory telephone company-cable television cross-ownership restrictions, will advance the FCC's goals of creating opportunities and incentives to develop an advanced telecommunications infrastructure, increasing competition in the video marketplace, and enhancing the diversity of video services to the American public in order to promote consumer choice.

The Commission decided that it will permit, but not require LECs to provide video dialtone to the public consistent with the existing regulatory framework for non-video enhanced services and subject to additional requirements. These additional requirements, which have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), provided, in relevant part, that: (1) LECs wishing to offer video dialtone must make available to multiple service providers, on a nondiscriminatory common carrier basis, a basic platform that will deliver video programming and potentially other services to end users; (2) local telephone companies will be permitted to provide some additional enhanced and other non-common carrier services to customers of the common carrier platform, and the Commission will apply existing safeguards against anticompetitive conduct; and (3) in addition to existing requirements of Part 63, telephone companies that wish to offer video dialtone must describe how their proposed construction and operation of the basic platform will serve multiple video programmers and expand as demand increases.

In CC Docket No. 87-266, MO&O on Reconsideration and Third FNPRM, the Commission requires LECs providing video dialtone service to notify the Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau of any anticipated or existing capacity shortfall in their video dialtone platform

and of plans for addressing such shortfall. Such notice must be provided within thirty days after the LEC becomes aware of an anticipated shortfall or within five days after denying capacity to a video programmer, whichever occurs first. The Commission also conforms its existing enhanced services safeguards against anticompetitive conduct by adding video dialtone delivery service to the service categories for which it requires that Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBOCs) and GTE Service Corporation (GTE) report installation and maintenance activities. In addition, the Commission requires the RBOCs and GTE to file, within 90 days after publication in the **Federal Register**, a detailed description of the types of Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI) to which they anticipate having access as providers of video dialtone service, and to explain how they would plan to use such information in marketing video dialtone services to video programmers or consumers.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-1159 Filed 1-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

Public Information Collection Requirement Submitted to Office of Management and Budget for Review

January 6, 1995.

The Federal Communications Commission has submitted the following information collection requirements to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3507).

Copies of these submissions may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., 2100 M Street, NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037, (202) 857-3800. For further information on this submission contact Dorothy Conway, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418-0217 or via internet at DConway@FCC.GOV. Persons wishing to comment on this information collection should contact Timothy Fain, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10214 NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395-3561.

OMB Number: 3060-0411.

Title: § 1.720-1.735, Formal

Complaints Against Common Carriers.

Action: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit; individuals or households; Not-

for-profit institutions; Federal Government and State, Local or Tribal Governments.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Annual Burden: 760 responses; 10 hours burden per response; 7,600 hours total annual burden.

Needs and Uses: § 1.720 through 1.735 of 47 CFR were promulgated to implement § 208 of the Communications Act 47 U.S.C. which provides that any person may file a complaint with the FCC regarding acts or omissions of common carriers subject to the Communications Act. This section obligates the FCC to serve such complaints on the affected carrier for response or resolution. The Commission is also obligated to investigate unsatisfied complaints. The information is used to determine whether a violation of the Communications Act or the Commission's rules has occurred.

OMB Number: 3060-0179.

Title: § 73.1590 Equipment Performance Measurements.

Action: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for profit.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Annual Burden: 12,753 responses; 0.64 hours per response (approximately 38 minutes); 8,127 hours total annual burden.

Needs and Uses: § 73.1590 request broadcast licensees to make audio and visual equipment performance measurements for each main transmitter and retain complete data at the transmitter. These measurements minimize the potential for interference to other stations. FCC staff use this information to identify sources of interference.

OMB Number: 3060-0210.

Title: § 73.1930 Political Editorials.

Action: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit.

Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Estimated Annual Burden: 2,309 responses; 3 hours per response; 6,927 hours total annual burden.

Needs and Uses: § 73.1930 requires that when a commercial licensee in an editorial opposes or endorses a candidate, the licensee must notify the other qualified candidate(s) for the same office or the candidate opposed. This information is used to provide a qualified candidate reasonable opportunity to respond to the editorial.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR 95-1160 Filed 1-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-F

[WT Dkt. No. 94-147: FCC 94-315]

Order To Show Cause, Hearing Designation Order and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing for Forfeiture

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Order to show cause, hearing designation order and notice of opportunity for hearing for forfeiture.

SUMMARY: On December 9, 1994 (released December 13, 1994), the Commission adopted an order which requires James A. Kay, Jr. (Kay), holder of one hundred sixty four land mobile licenses in the Los Angeles area to show cause why his licenses should not be revoked or cancelled, why he should not be ordered to cease and desist from certain violations of the Communications Act of 1934 as amended and the Commission's Rules, why an order for forfeiture should not issue, and designated the matters for a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge at a time and place to be designated in a subsequent Order.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: W. Riley Hollingsworth or William H. Kellett at (717) 337-1311, or Gary Schonman at (202) 632-6402.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Order to Show Cause, Hearing Designation Order and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing for Forfeiture adopted on December 9, 1994 and released on December 13, 1994. The full text of the order including a listing of the licenses at issue are available for inspection and copying at the FCC Docket Branch (Room 230) at 1919 M Street NW., Washington, DC. The text of the order may be purchased by calling ITS, at (202) 857-3800.

The Commission discussed generally alleged violations by Kay of the Communications Act as amended (the "Act") and of the Commission's Rules. The Commission Order relates to 164 Private Land Mobile licenses authorized under Part 90 of the Commission's Rules. 47 CFR 90.1 *et seq.* The Commission proceeded to designate the following issues for hearing:

(a) whether James A. Kay, Jr. has violated Section 308(b) of the Act and/or 47 CFR 1.17, by failing to provide requested information in his responses to Commission inquiries; (b) whether